

F8J5rioC

conference

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----x

RIO TINTO PLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

14 Civ. 3042 (RMB)

(AJP)

VALE, S.A., *et al.*,

Defendants.

-----x

New York, N.Y.  
August 19, 2015  
2:35 p.m.

Before:

HON. ANDREW J. PECK,

Magistrate Judge

F8J5rioC

conference

## APPEARANCES

QUINN EMANUEL

Attorneys for Plaintiff

BY: KEITH H. FORST

MICHAEL J. LYLE

ERIC C. LYTTLE

MEGHAN A. McCAFFREY

CLEARY, GOTTlieb, STEEN &amp; HAMILTON, LLP

Attorneys for Defendant Vale S.A.

BY: JONATHAN I. BLACKMAN

LEWIS J. LIMAN

MATTHEW M. KARLAN

MISHCON DE REYA NEW YORK LLP

Attorneys for Defendant BSG Resources Ltd.

BY: TIM MCCARTHY

SHAUNEIDA C. DePEIZA SALDENHA

SHER TREMONTE, LLP

Attorneys for Defendant VBG

BY: MICHAEL TREMONTE

SULLIVAN &amp; WORCESTER, LLP

Attorneys for Defendant Thiam

BY: ANDREW T. SOLOMON

NITA N. KUMARASWAMI

F8J5rioC

conference

1 (Case called)

2 THE COURT: All right. Some documents were just  
3 handed to me but we can wait until the appropriate point in our  
4 outline to get to that.

5 Based on late last night's letter from Rio Tinto  
6 withdrawing the E&Y issues from discussion we can turn and  
7 start at page 6 of the joint letter, correct?

8 MR. LYTTLE: Your Honor, there is one E&Y issue  
9 remaining. We would like to hand up a Hague letter request.

10 THE COURT: Okay.

11 MR. BLACKMAN: And, your Honor, we, on behalf of Vale,  
12 have no objection in concept to the letter of request but we do  
13 think that the time period covered by it is overbroad in terms  
14 of the parties' previous agreement going back to January on the  
15 scope of discovery on this particular due diligence subject and  
16 we have an alternative formulation which I would like to hand  
17 up, if I might.

18 THE COURT: Have you all talked about this?

19 MR. BLACKMAN: We have, and I am afraid we are at a  
20 bit of an impasse on that. The issue, very briefly, your  
21 Honor, is that after the initial discovery requests were served  
22 back a year ago and responded to, the parties of course  
23 negotiated and agreed, ultimately, that the scope of the  
24 diligence request to Vale from Rio Tinto would be January 1,  
25 2010 through April 30, 2010 -- April 30, 2010 being the date of

F8J5rioC

conference

1 the joint venture with BSGR and E&Y was retained by Clifford  
2 Chance to assist Clifford Chance in the diligence process. We  
3 have no objection to Rio Tinto seeking, through letters of  
4 request, to get information from E&Y affiliates that are not  
5 subject to subpoena in the United States but we don't think the  
6 scope, time-wise, should be any different than the scope of  
7 ending April 30, 2010 that has been followed throughout since  
8 the issue was first essentially agreed in January of this year.

9 THE COURT: Well, since none of you --

10 MR. BLACKMAN: I have the text.

11 THE COURT: You can hand it up also. What page of the  
12 existing letter are we talking about? It would have been nice  
13 if Rio Tinto has submitted this ahead of time.

14 MR. LYTTLE: Your Honor, we were negotiating.

15 MR. BLACKMAN: We just got them ourselves which is why  
16 they weren't part of the joint letter writing process.

17 MR. LYTTLE: Your Honor, we were attempting to  
18 negotiate these up to the last minute with counsel.

19 THE COURT: Are you definitely at an impasse?

20 MR. LYTTLE: We are, your Honor.

21 The date that they're seeking to impose of April 30th,  
22 2010, the due diligence, it is not clear it had begun at that  
23 point let alone finished.

24 I am looking at the engagement letter which, your  
25 Honor, is not even dated until the 7th of April, 2010, it is

F8J5rioC

conference

1 not signed by Vale until May 12, 2010. The focus of the work,  
2 your Honor, is FCPA-related analysis looking at bribery and  
3 corruption risks and the reports generated from that don't even  
4 come until late May. Then we have subsequent engagements with  
5 E&Y that come May 12 also looking at risks associated with the  
6 transaction, and another one in settlement of 2010, all looking  
7 at risks associated with the transaction with BSGR.

8 So, your Honor, the issue hear is more than just this  
9 letter of request. We agreed to, in the discovery responses  
10 with Vale, our cutoff of April 30th upon the representation  
11 that the due diligence was completed at that point. And your  
12 Honor, that is clear that is not the case. In fact it is  
13 continuing on and it is clear the deal is not even consummated  
14 on April 30th, 2010. Not only is it not proper to cut off the  
15 subpoena, the discovery from Vale is going to have to expand.  
16 We just have seen these documents in discovery.

17 MR. BLACKMAN: Your Honor, first of all, Rio Tinto has  
18 had, since the very first documents were produced in this case,  
19 eight, nine months ago, the agreement with BSGR which has a  
20 completion date, i.e. a closing date, of April 30, 2010. So,  
21 the idea that there wasn't a closed transaction is completely  
22 fanciful and due diligence, by definition, was done in  
23 connection with signing that document which was a legally  
24 enforceable contract.

25 We don't deny that work was done by E&Y afterwards but

F8J5rioC

conference

1 it wasn't due diligence on the deal. This is a bit reminiscent  
2 of the discussion we had some months ago of a fictional  
3 lookback that supposedly occurred on the diligence years after  
4 the transaction closed. Whatever these documents are about,  
5 they're not diligence for a closed transaction.

6 MR. LYTTLE: Your Honor, I am happy to show you the  
7 engagement letter but we also know --

8 THE COURT: Hand it up. But, if indeed the Vale BSGR  
9 transaction closed at the end of April 2010, what's the  
10 relevance of what happened afterwards?

11 MR. LYTTLE: Well, the relevance, your Honor, is that  
12 these firms are continuing to do due diligence on the  
13 corruption and bribery risk associated with that transaction.

14 THE COURT: But there is a contract at that point,  
15 April 30th. Either there was or wasn't any knowledge, and when  
16 one entered into it as to BSGR misconduct what difference does  
17 it make if they learned of it a year later or five years later  
18 or whatever else?

19 MR. BLACKMAN: Or today where we agree that it  
20 occurred and we learned many years later.

21 MR. LYTTLE: Your Honor, this was an ongoing  
22 conspiracy that continued well past the close of this deal. In  
23 fact that deal, your Honor, only -- it was a \$2.5 billion deal,  
24 they only paid \$500 million up front. They withheld --

25 THE COURT: Only and \$500 million in the same

F8J5rioC

conference

1 sentence.

2 MR. LYTTLE: Fair enough. They withheld \$2 billion on  
3 confirming that BSGR had proper title. Your Honor, I think it  
4 is imminently apparent that the advisor was advising them that  
5 Mr. Steinmetz was engaged in corruption. We have seen an  
6 e-mail where E&Y produces a due diligence report after the deal  
7 which tells them --

8 THE COURT: Let me finish you for one reason and cut  
9 you off. Whatever I rule, yes, you'll have a transcript you  
10 can show to my counterpart in the UK, but if you don't have an  
11 agreement with Vale whether that is based on compromises, they  
12 want April 2010, you want today, you compromise wherever; then  
13 whatever happens here, they're going to have the rights as  
14 certainly E&Y UK will have rights to argue otherwise in the  
15 High Court in London. You are much better off having an  
16 agreement.

17 MR. LYTTLE: Your Honor, when it is clear that due  
18 diligence is advising them of bribery and corruption risks that  
19 is extending well past April 30th, 2010, we can't agree not to  
20 seek that. That is the most relevant evidence in our case.

21 THE COURT: What paragraphs are we looking at here?

22 MR. LYTTLE: Can I come up and hand the engagement  
23 letter to your Honor?

24 THE COURT: Skip that.

25 MR. LYTTLE: Okay.

F8J5rioC

conference

1 THE COURT: Let me try to read what you are asking to  
2 be produced in the UK. So, it is the letter of request and --

3 MR. LYTTLE: I apologize. The actual topics begin on  
4 page 20 and what we are gunning this off of is the engagement  
5 letter because they have withheld the report as privileged.  
6 That's the only issue we have tabled for further discussion  
7 with Vale. So, we have provided specificity, we are keying off  
8 the engagement letter and the very clear definition of the  
9 engagement letter of the scope of the work which again extended  
10 well past April 30th, 2010.

11 MR. BLACKMAN: And the issue, just in terms of  
12 formality, is really the first paragraph of what I handed up to  
13 your Honor setting forth the relevant time period. But, if I  
14 could speak to the broader question for a moment, and I know  
15 you admonished us not to argue the merits here, but if you just  
16 think about it for a moment, we entered into a binding contract  
17 under which we paid half a billion dollars and were  
18 contractually obligated to pay additional amounts totaling  
19 another \$2 billion or so when various contractual milestones  
20 were met. The idea that there is a "ongoing conspiracy," I  
21 don't know what that means in this context. We were  
22 contractually bound.

23 THE COURT: It means this isn't the summary judgment  
24 motion on trial.

25 MR. BLACKMAN: Exactly. That's why I prefaced it with



F8J5rioC

conference

1 a disclaimer but I am just saying it makes no sense what he  
2 said.

3 THE COURT: Next time not only preface it but bite  
4 your tongue.

5 MR. BLACKMAN: Okay, your Honor.

6 THE COURT: Frankly, this looks like it is much ado  
7 about nothing because the requests A through O all seem to gear  
8 to reports. I mean, some of this may be overly broad and, you  
9 know, I don't know whether I should restrict it or say have fun  
10 in London. But, to the extent it is dealing with specific  
11 reports and subjects of bribery and corruption in and around  
12 April/May 2010, it doesn't bother me that we are in May.

13 I am concerned if there was a different report  
14 prepared by E&Y UK or any other E&Y entity that is going to be  
15 in the E&Y UK files that will get picked up by this.

16 H. I'm not exactly sure what that is and why it,  
17 under U.S. discovery, let alone the Hague convention in the UK,  
18 is not a fishing expedition. Certainly, as I understand the  
19 way the UK deals with it when you are looking for specifics,  
20 that's fine. The report, the things immediately leading up to  
21 it, drafts of the report. Okay, I think you can probably get  
22 that in the UK. When you are talking about e-mails, letters,  
23 documents, communications, I don't even know what all of this  
24 is.

25 MR. LYTTLE: Your Honor, what we are trying to do is

F8J5rioC

conference

1 get after -- we are doing the best we can based on the  
2 engagement letter. Many of these documents are being withheld  
3 and privilege has not otherwise been provided to us but, given  
4 the schedule, we want to get this request out. We tried to  
5 subpoena the E&Y U.S. which is the entity Vale identified and  
6 they told us to take a hike, told us to go to the UK. We are  
7 trying to do that now.

8 THE COURT: To a certain extent you made your bed and  
9 now you are lying in it, and by that I mean I am not sure that  
10 Vale has any more sway over E&Y in foreign countries than you  
11 do over the, you know, various people who did your  
12 investigation and you have made them jump through all sorts of  
13 hoops, or at least they have had to jump through all sorts of  
14 hoops perhaps because of the way Rio Tinto dealt with this so  
15 now you are going to do the same thing.

16 How soon, you know, the Court in the UK will deal with  
17 this? I am not inclined to limit it but I am not inclined to  
18 prevent Vale from going into court in the UK and moving to  
19 intervene or using the E&Y lawyers as their proxy behind the  
20 scenes and objecting to the time period and the scope of this.

21 Meanwhile, needless to say since I have not seen this  
22 before two seconds ago, I am in no position to sign it without  
23 looking at it later. So, that's where it is going to go. I am  
24 not insisting that they put in your limitation paragraph of  
25 limiting it to the period through April 30. I am not sure,

F8J5rioC

conference

1 since it is tied to a retainer of E&Y shortly thereafter that  
2 it is going to make any difference in the real world and you  
3 can do whatever you want to do in the UK.

4 MR. BLACKMAN: Thank you, your Honor.

5 THE COURT: And/or, within the next day you can  
6 consider, before this gets sent through the bureaucracy to the  
7 UK, whether there is any way you all can spend a little more  
8 time and try to come to an agreement either as to the date or  
9 as to the paragraphs which, frankly, don't even seem to have  
10 been rewritten by Vale that go beyond the reports and the bases  
11 for the reports to any and all communications which seem overly  
12 broad. And I may well strike it out on my own as I read  
13 through it. You will have to wait for that.

14 MR. LYTTLE: Thank you, your Honor.

15 MR. BLACKMAN: Thank you.

16 THE COURT: Okay. So, page 6, the clawback and the  
17 interrogatory 22.

18 As to interrogatory 22, it seems to me -- you can sit  
19 down, Mr. Liman -- that Rio Tinto should identify the law firms  
20 which seems now to be known and the lawyers at the law firms  
21 who were involved and what their knowledge is or whatever will  
22 be played out down the road.

23 MR. BLACKMAN: Thank you, your Honor.

24 MR. LYTTLE: Your Honor, we are happy to identify  
25 these firms. I can do it now. They're not, as we understand

F8J5rioC

conference

1 it, responsive to interrogatory no. 22. And, your Honor, the  
2 way that interrogatory no. 22 has been, in our view, used and  
3 abused in this process it would be wrong, in our current  
4 understanding, to identify them. We are not contending these  
5 names are privileged --

6 THE COURT: Here is what you are going to do. Then do  
7 it as an interrogatory of your own or an affidavit. Just get  
8 them in a formal way, not on the record now, the names of the  
9 law firms and the lawyers or other staff at the law firms who  
10 are involved. How soon can you get that done? Monday?

11 MR. LYTTLE: We can do that by Monday, your Honor.

12 THE COURT: So Ordered.

13 The other issue with respect to this paragraph is  
14 clawback of a certain document. Obviously there is a 502(d)  
15 order in place so the only question is not the fact that you  
16 have it, Mr. Liman, but whether the document itself is  
17 privileged or not. Why don't you hand the document up?

18 MR. LIMAN: Your Honor, that is what you have in front  
19 of you.

20 THE COURT: Ah.

21 MR. LIMAN: You have three documents in front of you;  
22 the first document is the document at issue, it is Bates  
23 labeled RTTAR 26596 and, just to be clear, we are not seeking  
24 the entire document, we are seeking only portions of it. We  
25 accept a claim of privilege and relevance with respect to some

F8J5rioC

conference

1 of it. What we are seeking is the initial e-mail from an  
2 Eileen Lerum, L-E-R-U-M, that is dated May 22nd, and then the  
3 Trudy Stedman e-mail that is the last in the sequence but there  
4 we are seeking the first two paragraphs and then the item  
5 marked no. 2. We are not seeking the item marked no. 1 which  
6 does appear to contain privileged information.

7 If I could just be clear, also, about the other  
8 documents we passed up? They belong together. There is an  
9 e-mail dated June 3rd, 2009 Bates stamped RT 652172 to 73 and  
10 then the attachment which is Bates stamped 2174. Those are the  
11 due diligence notes for the offering. And on page 2184 there  
12 is a reference to the preparation of a lawsuit with respect to  
13 Simandou against BSGR. That information tracks the information  
14 that is in the document at issue.

15 One last thing to note, you will see that there is a  
16 threshold of \$350 million that is referred to in the document  
17 at issue. That number happens to correspond to about 5 percent  
18 of Rio Tinto's operating income which, given the initial  
19 e-mail, is not accidental, this is a document about accounting  
20 prepared for accounting purposes consistent with the relevant  
21 accounting literature to report loss and gain contingencies to  
22 the --

23 THE COURT: All right. Now let's go back. I don't  
24 see where on page 2184 what you are talking about so without  
25 reading into a public record anything that is attorney's eyes

F8J5rioC

conference

1 only or whatever, just try to clue me in.

2 MR. LIMAN: Your Honor, if you look at 21083, item,  
3 the heading is 7 which asks for an update on the situation.

4 THE COURT: Okay. Got it. Okay.

5 MR. LIMAN: And then, actually, if you follow down the  
6 bullet points on 2183 and 2184 --

7 THE COURT: Am I correct that there is no claim of  
8 clawing back either of these two documents, the 652172 or the  
9 652174, et al?

10 MR. LYTTLE: That's correct.

11 THE COURT: Okay. With that, I guess let's take it in  
12 pieces.

13 Is there any objection to producing the Eileen Lerum  
14 e-mail?

15 MR. LYTTLE: No.

16 THE COURT: Okay, so you will do that or reproduce it  
17 in such a way that it is not attached to material that may or  
18 may not be clawed back.

19 Now, with respect to the e-mail from Trudy Stedman, I  
20 guess if you have the information otherwise -- and this sort of  
21 goes to both sides, if you have the information why do you need  
22 the e-mail unless it gets you a slightly different date? And  
23 conversely, to Rio Tinto, if that same information is in a  
24 document that isn't privileged and Mr. Liman is willing to have  
25 redaction of other information from the Trudy Stedman e-mail,

F8J5rioC

conference

1     why are you all fighting in front of me on this?

2             MR. LIMAN: Your Honor, maybe I will go first in terms  
3     of why we want the document and it has to do with evidence.

4             This document, to us, is frankly one of the best  
5     pieces of evidence in the case that establishes that back in  
6     2009 two things; no one, Rio Tinto was aware of the injury, and  
7     no. 2 -- and that, your Honor, is a contested question on  
8     motion to dismiss, one of the things that Rio Tinto says is the  
9     injury occurred later on. This makes it clear they were suing  
10    for something or intended to sue for something, instructed to  
11    sue for something.

12            Second, your Honor, what this document shows is that  
13    the very lawsuit that they're bringing now with the exception  
14    of the allegations about Cilins, all of which goes back to  
15    things about corruption, are things that they could have  
16    brought in 2009.

17            Now, there will be argument, no doubt, by Rio Tinto,  
18    that this document doesn't disprove their claim of equitable  
19    tolling but it clearly is highly relevant to the subject of  
20    equitable tolling when you have an instruction bringing a  
21    lawsuit against BSGR in the jurisdictions as to which BSGR is  
22    subject to personal jurisdiction.

23            MR. LYTTLE: Your Honor, I think what is nice is we  
24    don't actually have to debate this.

25            Mr. Liman, there is another document he can share with

F8J5rioC

conference

1 you which I would like it pass up which if I may approach, your  
2 Honor?

3 THE COURT: Yes.

4 MR. LYTTLE: Which indicates that this contemplated  
5 lawsuit in 2009 had nothing to do with bribery or corruption or  
6 fraud. The time period is critical there. Rio Tinto was still  
7 mining and still has its equipments on blocks 1 and 2 and  
8 Mr. Steinmetz is moving in.

9 THE COURT: Isn't all of that the issue that Judge  
10 Berman or the jury is going to have to decide? And what I have  
11 got to decide for discovery purposes is is this privileged, do  
12 you care because you are going to say it had nothing to do with  
13 this anyway. Under 502(a), particularly if you are ordered to  
14 produce it over at least a weak objection you have not got a  
15 waiver of subject matter. So, you know, why do you care? What  
16 do I care?

17 MR. LYTTLE: I appreciate that, your Honor, because it  
18 is clearly being misconstrued. It is not relevant to the  
19 equitable tolling and weighs into the privilege.

20 THE COURT: Excuse me. That I can't decide.

21 MR. LYTTLE: But you can, your Honor. You have a  
22 letter sent to Mr. Steinmetz and Mr. Avidan which is the exact  
23 legal proceedings contemplated there and it just says, Get your  
24 equipment off our blocks, you are interfering with our rights.  
25 It doesn't say we are suing you for bribery. Nothing indicates



F8J5rioC

conference

1 that they are looking at Vale, nothing in that document that we  
2 are clawing back indicates they're looking at a RICO  
3 conspiracy. Nothing even indicates they're looking at fraud.

4 THE COURT: I agree with you. The document says what  
5 it says.

6 MR. LYTTLE: Your Honor, on the privilege issue I  
7 think your point is well taken. They have this clearly in  
8 other sources and it is in a different form. This is all  
9 attorneys talking about this and it is talking about the value  
10 and the damages none of which is included in this document they  
11 have. So, there clearly was a change. They've got the  
12 official non-privileged version. We didn't withhold it, all we  
13 withheld was a privilege discussion among lawyers and only  
14 lawyers about legal strategy and the legal status of cases.

15 MR. LIMAN: Your Honor, obviously with respect to  
16 privilege, the fact that lawyers are on it is not the question  
17 that is a dispositive of question of privilege. The underlying  
18 questioning is is this a communication that either reflects  
19 legal advice or is made for the purpose of obtaining legal  
20 advice. The document, on its face, reflects an instruction.  
21 The only conceivable claim with respect to reflecting legal  
22 advice is what my colleague just said with respect to damages  
23 but even that is not a good argument because the threshold is  
24 an accounting threshold, it doesn't say this is the value of  
25 the lawsuit. It just says it exceeds that.

F8J5rioC

conference

1 But, with respect to an instruction to bring a  
2 lawsuit --

3 THE COURT: So, let's see if we can refine this  
4 further.

5 If the paragraph about damages is redacted is the fact  
6 of an instruction to counsel in the paragraph immediately above  
7 that which is a factual matter that may or may not be relevant  
8 to the statute of limitations issue, anything that you care to  
9 fight about?

10 MR. LYTTLE: Your Honor, I think with that and I think  
11 with the other redactions Mr. Liman discussed in particular  
12 paragraph 1, I am not sure I agree with you. I am not sure  
13 this is worth fighting over anymore.

14 THE COURT: In that case, make all of those redactions  
15 and produce a copy in redacted form by Friday that can be  
16 utilized and that does not have the clawback aspects of it.

17 MR. LYTTLE: Thank you, your Honor.

18 THE COURT: In order to not have quasi-privileged  
19 material floating around in my already overflowing files I am  
20 giving you all back your various documents.

21 So, now we jump all the way over to page 13 to which  
22 you promised me an update that I don't really need or want at  
23 this point so let's skip that and go over, that's why the  
24 Special Master is here, so I don't have to delve into it and by  
25 here, yes, I have noticed she is in the courtroom but I meant

F8J5rioC

conference

1 that she has been appointed so that I don't have to deal with  
2 the tar-related problems unless you don't agree with any of her  
3 recommendations and she writes a report and somebody objects  
4 and I deal with it.

5 So, now we go to page 14, IV, BSGR and Steinmetz. My  
6 first question to all of you is: Why me? Which is to say this  
7 is discovery, at least for now under the auspices of the Court  
8 in the UK. What authority -- I will rephrase -- not what  
9 authority -- I have the authority to convert all of this back  
10 into federal rules of discovery which is something that we all  
11 have been trying to avoid until Judge Berman rules on the BSGR  
12 Steinmetz motions for lack of jurisdiction, etc.

13 So, this may be an issue that if you all could work  
14 out I would be happy to help you, perhaps, but otherwise, what  
15 is my authority?

16 MR. FORST: Your Honor, Keith Forst on behalf of Rio  
17 Tinto.

18 So, I think your Honor hit the nail on the head on  
19 what we are concerned about which is that we are waiting for  
20 Judge Berman's decision which could very well mean that as we  
21 think it is going to be is that BSGR is subject to personal  
22 jurisdiction here and subject to the Federal Rules of Evidence  
23 for purposes of discovery. I know, your Honor, we jockeyed  
24 over that issue months ago and we went to the UK, again on  
25 promises of BSGR that we would make a production and make a

F8J5rioC

conference

1 comprehensive production again somewhere in the middle between  
2 UK and U.S. proceedings. Where we think your Honor can give  
3 some guidance is one we would respectfully submit, if we think  
4 now is the time that quite hasn't worked out the way we hoped  
5 and we are in a position of if Judge Berman rules, we are going  
6 to be behind months threatening depositions.

7 THE COURT: First of all, you all seem to be falling  
8 behind on your own without any help from the Court as we have  
9 already pushed back the document production schedule and all of  
10 that stuff. You know, it would be nice if Judge Berman rules.

11 MR. FORST: Sure.

12 THE COURT: It would be nice if there weren't a  
13 million satellite trucks outside and they're not for you,  
14 they're for another case in front of Judge Berman. Life is  
15 short. If and when Judge Berman says they're here, then we can  
16 revisit any discovery issues and convert the Hague Convention  
17 requests to good old normal Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.  
18 Having gone the route of going to the Hague by consent, it  
19 seems a little unseemly to say nothing has changed in terms of  
20 whether or not BSGR-Steinmetz are subject to U.S. discovery and  
21 U.S. jurisdiction because Judge Berman has taken too long in  
22 your view to rule but you would like, you know, a second bite  
23 at the apple here and I am not inclined to do that now.

24 I agree with you that if you don't work it out with  
25 BSGR they will be in the position and under a very tight time

F8J5rioC

conference

1 frame so I'm telling you that now, under the BSGR side, that if  
2 Judge Berman says you are here and the document production out  
3 of the UK is not sufficient because of the different standards  
4 or because they don't have a process like this where the  
5 parties can come in and complain that you didn't fully comply  
6 with with the Hague Convention requests, you are not going to  
7 get 30 days, you are going to get a week or something to redo  
8 what you have to redo. So.

9 MR. FORST: Your Honor, if I may?

10 I do think the one thing that we are asking -- and I  
11 can go through the list in a minute, but with search terms --  
12 is, again, what we are trying to do, from Rio Tinto's  
13 perspective, is a discussion. We had a productive meet and  
14 confer where we sent search terms and we simply asked can you  
15 run these? Or even some of these and give us some hits and we  
16 can take a look at that and further the discussion. We got  
17 blank across the board. The response that came back that said  
18 we will not run an additional term. And so, really our request  
19 to you, your Honor, with those search terms which is what we  
20 discussed at the last conference, was can we just run these and  
21 we think there are some gaps and admittedly a production of  
22 1,500 documents as compared to the tens and tens of thousands  
23 that are coming from the other parties and BSGR is just as  
24 involved, suggests that it was far too narrow and that's what's  
25 been born out. So, we asked for terms and they've been flatly

F8J5rioC

conference

1 refused without any real justification.

2 THE COURT: Who am I going to hear from from BSGR?

3 MR. McCARTHY: Your Honor, Tim McCarthy for BSGR.

4 There is a threshold issue here. At the last  
5 conference my colleague Mr. Filardo agreed to provide the  
6 search terms in culling the universe of documents in response  
7 to an inquiry from the Court and that inquiry from the Court,  
8 in turn, was based on representations from counsel to Rio Tinto  
9 about putative deficiencies in our production. That matters  
10 because these requests for additional search terms can't be  
11 merely speculative. As the Court knows, there has to be some  
12 indicia of deficiencies before that can be done. We agreed  
13 consensually to do it in the meet and confers. After that it  
14 turns out those representations about the supposed deficiencies  
15 in our production were wrong. For instance, Rio Tinto, in the  
16 July 24 joint letter and in the July 28th hearing, represented  
17 that there was a 2009 programming budget that had not been  
18 produced and that related documents had not been produced. In  
19 fact, it was and related documents had been produced.

20 There was a particular letter in response to request F  
21 of the letter of request that was identified later in meets and  
22 confers as something that was supposedly missing. It was  
23 produced.

24 I have a list of things as well. Bottom line is that  
25 to this day there has yet to be an identification of an actual

F8J5rioC

conference

1 deficiency anywhere in the production that would have justified  
2 the --

3 THE COURT: That may now be true, however it would  
4 appear that the search terms that were used do not comport with  
5 the case law on crafting of search terms. I mean, to only use  
6 Mr. Cilins' last name without a variant on his first name and  
7 belated issues as pointed out here, you know, that you very  
8 specifically searched for the term "land cruiser" but not other  
9 variants on that, that does strike me, under Judge Facciola's  
10 decision about where angels fear to tread and the need for  
11 expertise in crafting search terms, as well as my William A.  
12 Gross warning to the bar that these search terms certainly  
13 could have been better.

14 So, the question is, having in for a penny you want to  
15 be in for a nickel here, what is the harm in running the extra  
16 search terms they suggest and just seeing how many hits there  
17 are and then discussing that with them and then seeing whether  
18 there is not going to be anything there? You know the problem  
19 in proving a negative on the other side has conspiracy all over  
20 the place is that if there is no conspiracy there aren't going  
21 to be any documents.

22 But, I would say despite Sedona principle 6, your  
23 search terms left something to be desired.

24 MR. MCCARTHY: And we would argue, your Honor, that  
25 both the problem with that and the answer to that is that the

F8J5rioC

conference

1 case law here doesn't apply. This is governed by the principal  
2 of proportionality under English law.

3 THE COURT: Guess what? Our principle of  
4 proportionality is the same as theirs.

5 MR. MCCARTHY: That's right, and the "land cruiser"  
6 example is a good one. That request, in particular, calls for  
7 "the receipt or the invoice for the land cruiser." It doesn't  
8 call for any and all documents pertaining to "land cruisers."  
9 It doesn't call for any and all documents --

10 THE COURT: Did you produce the receipt for the land  
11 cruiser?

12 MR. MCCARTHY: I do not know whether we produced the  
13 receipt, your Honor. I am filling in. If I may turn to my  
14 associate for a moment?

15 THE COURT: Yes.

16 (Counsel conferring)

17 MR. MCCARTHY: It turns out that nothing turned up,  
18 your Honor.

19 THE COURT: That's the problem.

20 MR. MCCARTHY: That is the problem.

21 THE COURT: Is it because a land cruiser was not  
22 gifted to somebody? Or is it because the search term "land  
23 cruiser" may not be the way the invoice for the car was printed  
24 up? You know, however it may be. So, I am not saying you need  
25 to search for all documents about the land cruiser but if you



F8J5rioC

conference

1 didn't find it and the only thing you did was to search for the  
2 term, in quotes "land space cruiser" which might have been  
3 spelled differently, which might have been done as one word  
4 without a space and this wouldn't pick that up, other  
5 deficiencies, again, I'm not ordering you to do anything other  
6 than to consider what is going to happen either. You are going  
7 to get out of this case on jurisdictional grounds or you are  
8 likely going to be running these very search terms and many  
9 others down the road. The more you get out of the way now by  
10 working somewhat collegially under the Sedona cooperation  
11 proclamation principles with Rio Tinto, you know, most likely  
12 the revised search term around the land cruiser is either going  
13 to turn up one document or nothing. Or, since you couldn't  
14 find the invoice which is what was called for but you find an  
15 e-mail saying we decided against giving him a land cruiser or  
16 whatever, you know, you might voluntarily produce that.

17 All in all, I am strongly suggesting you work with Rio  
18 Tinto on the search terms as shown by the examples on page 15  
19 of the letter but I'm not ordering it.

20 MR. FORST: Okay, your Honor.

21 THE MARSHAL: Understood, your Honor.

22 MR. FORST: To be clear, we, in drafting the search  
23 terms which I did myself, we were sensitive to their concerns  
24 of proportionality. I wanted to put in the term "car" which of  
25 course would have brought back things maybe we would run in the

F8J5rioC

conference

1 U.S., but we purposefully tried to trim them back to make sure  
2 they were on point in connection with these requests.

3 So, I appreciate that and we will endeavor to work  
4 together.

5 THE COURT: We are heading towards an hour, can we  
6 move on to something I have jurisdiction over?

7 MR. FORST: Sure. I do have, I do want to point out  
8 the custodian issue quickly, though, that is only with respect  
9 to these two individuals that we note in our submission where  
10 we had the understanding last fall --

11 THE COURT: This is Mr. Toure and Mr. Bangoura?

12 MR. FORST: Correct; that BSGR had documents for these  
13 people.

14 THE COURT: They don't. So now what?

15 MR. FORST: They don't but what is troubling to us,  
16 your Honor, is if you remember the reason for that now is the  
17 Guinean government apparently seized them some time ago. We  
18 didn't know that until now but if you remember, based on  
19 discussions with VBG, there are procedures whereby the parties  
20 whose documents are seized can go to the Guinean government and  
21 request them. What shocks us is we are now almost a year later  
22 and maybe counsel will correct me, but there is no indication  
23 that there has been any attempts on BSGR to go request from the  
24 Guinean government these documents for people who were seized  
25 because of bribery, the very allegations in the case.

F8J5rioC

conference

1 THE COURT: Do these people still work for BSGR?

2 MR. McCARTHY: No, your Honor.

3 MR. FORST: But they have a right to the documents  
4 taken related to their employment.

5 THE COURT: I understand. What is BSGR's incentive,  
6 not to mention legal issue other than being more forthcoming if  
7 they knew this longer ago than now, and I suspect some of this  
8 is BSGR, unlike its counsel, is having as little involvement in  
9 this case as possible.

10 In any event, yes, it is unfortunate. Contact  
11 Mr. Toure and Mr. Bangoura, they're no longer within the BSGR  
12 ambit if they're ex-employees. If you want to ask them to ask  
13 the government for their documents, be my guest.

14 MR. FORST: Your Honor, you did require VBG to make  
15 that formal request of the Guinean government because these  
16 documents do belong to BSGR. These two individuals were BSGR  
17 employees and these are their documents that they have a right  
18 to.

19 THE COURT: Who is, under the law, the Guinean law --

20 MR. FORST: Right.

21 THE COURT: -- is it the person or the corporation?

22 MR. FORST: The corporation, as we understand it,  
23 through Guinean counsel working with VBG. VBG had the right to  
24 request the documents taken from their employees from their  
25 facilities, from everything.

F8J5rioC

conference

1 THE COURT: Mr. McCarthy?

2 MR. McCARTHY: Your Honor, as I think you have alluded  
3 to, the only disclosure obligation that we are under at this  
4 point -- we fully take on board your admonition about the  
5 timeline -- but the only discovery obligation that we have is  
6 letter of request, the High Court's order on the letter of  
7 request. The letter of request is specifically directed  
8 towards servers, documents, materials within the UK. We in  
9 fact have gone above and beyond and included in our production  
10 in response to that letter of request materials from Guernsey,  
11 from Israel, and from South Africa. Materials within the  
12 possession, custody and control of the government of Guinea  
13 because they were seized several years ago are not covered by  
14 that letter of request.

15 THE COURT: That is true. The question is sort of do  
16 you want to make that request now which will probably be  
17 ignored anyway but then you could say you were a good corporate  
18 citizen in my court, and then if and when you get any documents  
19 from the government of guinea you will decide what you want to  
20 do with them. Or you can say I have taken the position so far  
21 which, if you know me enough, I might reconsider, of not  
22 putting you through U.S. discovery.

23 THE MARSHAL: Understood, your Honor.

24 THE COURT: What is the harm of writing a letter to  
25 the government of Guinea saying we have learned that documents

F8J5rioC

conference

1 of your employees were seized, I would like copies.

2 MR. McCARTHY: There may be none and we will take it  
3 under advisement, discuss it with counsel of Rio Tinto and have  
4 a look at what VBG was ordered to do. Standing here today I am  
5 not conversant to that and can't consent to it.

6 MR. FORST: Let me respectfully point out that we  
7 didn't include things in the letter of request that we didn't  
8 know about. Again, last November we had the understanding that  
9 they had the documents.

10 THE COURT: Had you known I sincerely doubt that my  
11 colleague in the UK has any more authority to order the  
12 government of Guinea to do something, nor would it normally be  
13 a discovery obligation in the UK to go get documents seized by  
14 another government.

15 MR. FORST: Well, maybe not, but we would have been  
16 given the opportunity to go make that argument there and pursue  
17 it for sure. Now, instead --

18 THE COURT: You may be going back there if some of the  
19 issues that I am not getting involved in are not worked out by  
20 agreement.

21 MR. FORST: Okay.

22 THE COURT: I suppose they have motions to reconsider  
23 or, you know, help. Whatever.

24 MR. FORST: Sure.

25 THE COURT: I'm not ordering them to do anything. I

F8J5rioC

conference

1 again am suggesting cooperation. If not, if and when they are  
2 subject to the U.S. jurisdiction we will deal with it and, you  
3 know, the inability to produce the material may or may not,  
4 under the December 1st version of 37(e) impose any further  
5 obligations or penalties on BSGR. For today we are moving on.

6 MR. FORST: Your Honor, I only want to make clear that  
7 relates to the rest of the things in our letter that we are  
8 skirmishing about. You are encouraging us to go work it out.

9 THE COURT: I always encourage parties to cooperate  
10 about everything. So far my success rate in this case is not a  
11 hundred percent. We will put it at that.

12 As to discovery from Defendant Thiam, I don't think  
13 there is really anything you are asking me to rule on. It  
14 looks like everybody is cooperating? Anything further on that?

15 MS. McCAFFREY: No, your Honor.

16 THE COURT: Good.

17 Next the discovery from VBG, particularly with respect  
18 to the documents of Mr. Rezende. So, is he a Vale employee or  
19 a VBG employee? Both?

20 MR. FORST: Your Honor, let me just --

21 THE COURT: Well, Mr. Blackman has more information.

22 MR. BLACKMAN: Yes.

23 He is somebody who certainly was a Vale employee. He  
24 may still be a Vale employee. Like others, he was secunded to  
25 VBG in the period after the creation of the joint venture.

F8J5rioC

conference

1 THE COURT: So why are his e-mails not being searched?

2 MR. BLACKMAN: His e-mails in fact have been produced  
3 in many respects. He was not sought as a custodian. However,  
4 my understanding is that we actually have produced or are  
5 producing about 120 e-mails in which he was either a "to" or a  
6 "from" as part of our production of documents.

7 THE COURT: Coming from somebody else's files?

8 MR. BLACKMAN: Yes, exactly. So, it is not like --

9 THE COURT: What would the burden be -- and I don't  
10 know if the cost is yours or VBG's but since he has two hats, a  
11 Vale hat and VBG hat, why aren't you going to search his files  
12 at least for his VBG-related role?

13 MR. LIMAN: Your Honor, I spoke to him this morning.  
14 I got questions also. I gave the questions we were going to  
15 ask him to counsel for VBG. The answer is about \$150,000 to  
16 get his custodial e-mails, to search them and to review them.

17 There is also a more fundamental point with respect to  
18 Mr. Rezende. Mr. Rezende began working at VBG in April of  
19 2011. He ceased working there in December of 2012. Prior to  
20 April 2011 he had no involvement with the Simandou project.  
21 While he was at VBG he had no responsibility with respect to  
22 any of the alleged trade secrets, that is, with respect to the  
23 port and the rail options. Those were already in place as of  
24 April 2011, he had nothing to do with them. As to drilling  
25 site selection for Simandou I and II and resource estimates,

F8J5rioC

conference

1 again, that was largely done before he arrived. He had nothing  
2 to do with them.

3 We asked about the technical committee because that's  
4 been an issue. He did not prepare, was not involved in the  
5 preparation of the responses for the technical committee.

6 Now, a long time ago when we were in front of your  
7 Honor with respect to trade secrets back in November, the issue  
8 came up of what about the utilization of information allegedly  
9 taken. Your Honor said back then that the utilization of  
10 alleged information was not particularly relevant except for a  
11 limited time period after it was allegedly taken which would be  
12 2009. After that, if they were involved in the joint venture,  
13 etc., it would have been getting information from other sources  
14 and it gets very complicated, keep it limited to begin with.

15 So, that's the reason why we think Rezende has really  
16 nothing to do with this case.

17 MR. FORST: Your Honor, this is admittedly, and maybe  
18 we will take that time period for which he worked for VBG which  
19 is a different entity, we have different discovery requests for  
20 VBG and have agreed to different search terms and that is  
21 happening in parallel with VBG. VBG has said, and I think  
22 VBG's counsel is here and can speak, that they have requested  
23 Mr. Rezende' e-mails for the time period that he worked for VBG  
24 and I will note, your Honor, we have a original chart where he  
25 was second in command over all these technical areas including



F8J5rioC

conference

1 railways.

2 THE COURT: So, let me hear from VBG counsel. Just  
3 remind me who you are.

4 MR. TREMONTE: Michael Tremonte, your Honor.

5 I would like to follow up on Mr. Liman's remarks  
6 because what is true with respect to Mr. Rezende is in fact  
7 true with respect to each and every one of the VBG custodians  
8 whose e-mail accounts were hosted by Vale.

9 THE COURT: Okay, but that ship has sailed. You had  
10 an argument on that. You agreed or a ruled. Sobeit. The only  
11 problem seems to be with Rezende because you want the e-mails  
12 so that you can go through them and do what you have to do and  
13 Mr. Liman, according to the letters or his counterpart, said  
14 no. So --

15 MR. TREMONTE: Well, with respect to Mr. Rezende our  
16 position is set forth in the letter and it is even clearer  
17 after today that he was a Vale employee and he is therefore not  
18 a custodian --

19 THE COURT: April 2011 through December 2012 he was  
20 secunded to you. That makes him your employee for that  
21 purpose.

22 MR. TREMONTE: I'm not sure that that is right. I  
23 think the fact that he was on premises or at the site is one  
24 thing but I don't know that he was --

25 THE COURT: Was he the no. 2 to whoever the no. 1 was?

F8J5rioC

conference

1 MR. FORST: In the original chart, your Honor, the  
2 no. 1 says vacant so he is the no. 2 with the name there.

3 THE COURT: All right.

4 MR. TREMONTE: I have to go back and confirm his  
5 precise position but I don't believe there is a legal argument  
6 that he was an employee of VBG.

7 THE COURT: The legal argument seems to me somebody  
8 has to do something between you and Vale and the question may  
9 be who is paying for it, what the extent of the search is and  
10 how much, if any, Rio Tinto wants to kick in. Are you telling  
11 me, Mr. Liman, that the \$150,000 estimate you had is for the  
12 year, less than a year and a half period of April 2011 to  
13 December 2012? Or is it for his entire period for which Vale  
14 has files?

15 MR. LIMAN: Your Honor, I believe it is for the  
16 relevant time period. It is a very rough estimate but that is  
17 the --

18 THE COURT: Is that for the cost of search or what,  
19 exactly?

20 MR. LIMAN: It is the search, it is review, it is  
21 designation as ADO, privilege review and the like.

22 I can answer your Honor's question with respect to his  
23 role. He was one of three people who were recorded during the  
24 time period that he was there, to the person who ran VBG. His  
25 responsibilities were largely operational ones. There were

F8J5rioC

conference

1 people who preceded him who were involved with respect to the  
2 issues of site selection and the ports and the like. Those  
3 people's e-mails, my understanding is, are being produced.

4 MR. TREMONTE: And if I may, your Honor, all of the  
5 remaining custodians that are still being discussed -- I think  
6 there is 10 -- fall into this category and if, at \$100,000-plus  
7 each we are going to spend a million dollars reviewing e-mails  
8 when we know in advance, almost to a certainty, that there is  
9 nothing relevant.

10 THE COURT: Here is what we are going to do: You are  
11 going to do a sample in some way that you are going to work out  
12 with Rio Tinto as to whether there is going to be anything  
13 relevant. So, if there are -- I think we are back in the key  
14 word world for this -- come up with key words and Vale and VBG  
15 and we are going to limit it to the VBG time period, you will  
16 figure out which of them is footing the bill for this or how  
17 they're going to do it and you will come up with something that  
18 is going to cost somewhere in the neighborhood of \$5,000, maybe  
19 10, no more than that, and see whether there is or isn't  
20 material that Mr. Rezende has in his VBG period that is not  
21 being picked up by the other custodians. And if there are  
22 other custodians that are being fought about it is not in the  
23 letter to me so it is not on the table for today.

24 MR. TREMONTE: Your Honor, if I may?

25 THE COURT: You can snatch what I think is some

F8J5rioC

conference

1 victory for you, you know, and get into a worse position, but  
2 go ahead.

3 MR. TREMONTE: Okay. In that case, your Honor, I just  
4 want -- a little bit of housekeeping I want to clarify the  
5 record.

6 Last time I was before the Court I failed to report,  
7 because I didn't know at the time, that on the day before all  
8 of the documents that had been in the possession of VBG's prior  
9 counsel in Paris that had been produced to the technical  
10 committee had in fact been produced to Rio Tinto before I  
11 appeared. I don't want the record to be inaccurate in that  
12 respect.

13 THE COURT: Good. All right. I am sure I am going to  
14 regret this question but are there any additional issues that  
15 we need to deal with today that are not in the letter in front  
16 of me?

17 MR. LIMAN: Your Honor, there is a discrepancy with  
18 respect to the reservation of rights on the E&Y documents. We  
19 previously wrote to Mr. Forst to indicate the nature of the  
20 reservation. I assume we don't need to lodge that with the  
21 Court? And if it becomes an issue I --

22 THE COURT: If it was in a letter you advised me of  
23 it. I am sure I won't remember it any more or less when it  
24 becomes a live issue, whether you raise it today or just in the  
25 letter.

F8J5rioC

conference

1           One housekeeping matter. Why doesn't Rio Tinto put  
2 together for me all of the letter briefing that I have gotten  
3 on the, whatever the name of your document is, Mr. Liman.

4           MR. LYTTLE: Nardello, your Honor.

5           THE COURT: Thank you; so that way I will have it all  
6 in front of me again and I will get it?

7           MR. LYTTLE: Would you like it in addition to filing  
8 ECF or hand-delivered to you?

9           THE COURT: Since it has all been previously filed on  
10 ECF just send a set with a cover letter "over by hand" or by  
11 "Fed Ex," whatever.

12          MR. LYTTLE: Okay. We will do that, your Honor.

13          One housekeeping matter on the E&Y letter  
14 conversations taken today and your Honor's advice and thoughts  
15 into it. I think we may make some revisions so I request that  
16 perhaps you hold off in reviewing that one and we will submit a  
17 separate one.

18          THE COURT: Well, here is the issue that I think I  
19 have told you before: Friday is my last day in the office for  
20 two weeks. If you get me something before Friday I can sign  
21 it. While discovery emergencies or whatever my clerks will be  
22 working and can get things to me, a letter of request does not  
23 work well on a Blackberry or even an iPad. I am not going to  
24 deal with it during those two weeks. So, whatever your urgency  
25 is or isn't, if you get me something know that I have got

F8J5rioC

conference

1 Friday fairly heavily booked. So, if you get me something  
2 before Friday and I have a chance to look at it, I will sign  
3 it. If you don't, I won't.

4 So.

5 MR. LYTTLE: We will, your Honor.

6 MR. BLACKMAN: And on that score, your Honor, again  
7 taking on board what you said, we would like to see the draft  
8 and hopefully have a chance to have some input into it, so  
9 maybe as our other letters of request were, this can be agreed  
10 as opposed to not.

11 THE COURT: I think, A, agreement is highly unlikely  
12 and I think reading between the lines what I am hearing is that  
13 some of the requests that might be perfectly fine in American  
14 parlance, you know, documents, communications, e-mails, etc.,  
15 they may be trying to sharpen. Certainly if you are adding  
16 anything as opposed to subtracting I expect you to let  
17 Mr. Blackman have a small window of opportunity to look at it.  
18 If all you are doing is narrowing it, again, you know, if the  
19 two-week gap urgency is such it might be that with today's  
20 discussion you can, indeed, get agreement. Maybe that's  
21 hopeless. I leave it to all of you.

22 MR. BLACKMAN: Thank you, your Honor.

23 THE COURT: Date for our next session? What is your  
24 pleasure? What do you need?

25 MR. LIMAN: Your Honor, I don't know that we have a

F8J5rioC

conference

1 calendar in front of us with a particular day and date of the  
2 week, but if we could have a date sometime shortly before  
3 September 27th? September 27th is a day that a number of us  
4 will be out of town.

5 THE COURT: The 27th is a Sunday, we can do it the  
6 afternoon of the 24th which is the day after Yom Kippur. If  
7 that works we can do it the week before so we are not near Yom  
8 Kippur. Whatever you all want.

9 MR. LIMAN: The only thing I would ask is if we do it  
10 the day after Yom Kippur, if we could set a time period for  
11 submitting the letter to your Honor so that those of us who are  
12 observant are able to observe the holiday.

13 THE COURT: If we do it on Thursday the 24th you can  
14 get the letter in on Monday, the 21st, or the morning of  
15 Tuesday the 22nd. Whatever your pleasure is on that.

16 MR. LIMAN: Your Honor, I think that works for  
17 everybody. We would also ask that the letter go in on Monday  
18 night that would give your Honor a chance to review it.

19 THE COURT: Yes, since they tend to be long letters.  
20 All right, September 24th, 2:30.

21 All right. So, enjoy the rest of your summer even  
22 though I know you are all working hard. For those it applies  
23 to, Happy New Year in advance since I won't see you until  
24 afterwards.

25 We are adjourned.

F8J5rioC

conference

1           Usual drill with the transcript; reading the Court's  
2 rules you all have to buy it.

3                           o0o